



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/479,999	01/10/2000	LEE EVEN NAKAMURA	A7631/ST9-97	3788

7590 12/21/2001

SUGHRUE MION ZINN MACPEAK & SEAS PLLC
2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE N W
WASHINGTON, DC 200373202

EXAMINER

HUYNH, CONG LAC T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2176

DATE MAILED: 12/21/2001

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

TR

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/479,999

Applicant(s)

NAKAMURA ET AL.

Examiner

Cong-Lac Huynh

Art Unit

2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 January 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 7-12 and 27-31 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 7-12 and 27-31 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
 If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
 1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
 * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
 a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 2. 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: application filed on 01/10/00 which is a continuation of the application 08/892,842 filed on 7/11/97, now US Pat No. 6,178,433 B1.

2. Claims 1-6, 13-26 are canceled.

3. Claims 7-12, 27-31 are pending in the case. Claims 7, 11 and 27 are the independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

5. ~~Claims 28-31~~ are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 28-31 are considered as the hybrid claims since they are the system claims dependent on independent claim 27 which is a computer-readable medium claim.

Please correct.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2176

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 7-12, 27-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brown, *Using Netscape 2, Que Corporation*, pages 8-11.

Regarding independent claim 7, Brown discloses:

- generating a page of presentation material in response to a request for an information, wherein the page is generated based on the first information layout and includes the first information and does not contain the second information (figure 1.4, when a user selects NFL from the list of items on the left side and, only the information about NFL is displayed on the right side of the page; the information of Cyberspace Showdown III or Raiders' Fan Wins Contest! are not shown)

Brown does not disclose defining in one file a variable for each information and defining in one file a presentation layout for each information.

However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified Brown to include defining said variable and said presentation layout to Brown. The fact that an item in the list is displayed on the right side of the web page in response to a user's selection suggests that in the program for executing that feature, such a variable is defined for each correspondent information in order to retrieve that information for displaying with the corresponding presentation

Art Unit: 2176

layouts. In addition, since the items on the list are belong to the NFL home page, this feature suggests that the variables and the corresponding presentation layouts are defined in one file to facilitate the retrieving and editing data of the NFL home page.

Regarding claims 8 and 10, which are dependent on claim 7, Brown discloses that said page is World Web page for displaying on the web browser and the request, which is actually a hyperlink, includes a uniform resource locator URL (figure 1.4).

Regarding claim 9, which are dependent on claim 7, Brown discloses that the web browser does not support a hypertext markup language frame tag (figure 1.4).

Claims 11-12 are for a system of method claims 7-10, and are rejected under the same rationale.

Claims 27-31 are for a system of method claims 7-10, and are rejected under the same rationale.

Conclusion

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Astiz et al. (US Pat No. 6,035,330, 3/7/00, filed 3/29/96) – World Wide Web navigational mapping system and method.

Art Unit: 2176

Brobst et al. (US Pat No. 6,061,700, 5/9/00, filed 8/8/97) – Apparatus and method for formatting a web page.


Homer et al., *Instant HTML*, Wrox Press, 1997.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cong-Lac Huynh whose telephone number is 703-305-0432. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri (8:30-6:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon can be reached on 703-308-5186. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-746-7239 for regular communications and 707-746-7238 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-9000.

clh
12/13/01


STEPHEN S. HONG
PRIMARY EXAMINER